

Remarks

Favorable review is requested in view of the following remarks. Editorial amendments have been made to claims 31, 32, 34, and 46. Claims 48 and 49 have been cancelled, and claims 51 and 52 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 31 – 47 and 50 – 52 are pending in the application.

Claims 39 – 42 were previously withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request that claims 39 – 42 be entered and allowed once claim 31 is allowed.

Interview Summary

Examiner Vinh and Charles Jacobson, applicants' representative, conducted a teleconference on July 26, 2006. During the teleconference, Examiner Vinh and Mr. Jacobson discussed U.S. Patent 5,192,699 and possible claim amendments.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 31 – 38, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bulat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,192,699). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following comments.

Claim 31 requires that the mating element is an actuator in a disc drive. Bulat et al. fail to teach or suggest that the mating element is an actuator in a disc drive. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 43 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bulat et al. (above) in view of Berry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,344,383). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following comments.

Bulat et al. are distinguished above as failing to teach or suggest that the mating element is an actuator in a disc drive. Berry et al. are relied upon to describe or suggest ion beam etching. Even if it does, which is not being conceded, this reference fails to remedy the noted shortcomings of Bulat et al. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claims 45 – 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bulat et al. (above) in view of Peterson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,344,383). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, and respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following comments.

Claim 45 requires inserting the mating element into the feature. Bulat et al. fail to teach or suggest inserting the mating element into the feature. Peterson et al. are relied upon to describe or suggest a MEMS device. Even if it does, which is not being conceded, this reference fails to remedy the noted shortcomings of Bulat et al. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Conclusion

In view of the comments presented herein, favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If any further questions should arise, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the number listed below.

Date: July 27, 2006

By: Charles A. Jacobson

Charles A. Jacobson
Reg. No. 53,061
Intellectual Property Department – NRW097
Seagate Technology LLC
7801 Computer Avenue South
Bloomington, MN 55435
Telephone: (952) 402-7896
Attorney for Applicants

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8

Date of Deposit: July 27, 2006

I hereby certify that this Amendment and the documents referred to as attached therein are being transmitted via facsimile to facsimile number 571.273.8300 at the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown above.

Charles A. Jacobson